



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Latin may not be above reproach), (1309 entoces . . . quion), 1342 ni, 1437 hablaredes, (1449 cendero), 1454 vees, (1458 que lo que), 1509 no vs, 1543 en llespital, 1576 allega, (1762 guerta), (1797 Salamon), 1848 reprhende, 1876 desta, 1881 callademente, 1887 azia a, 1896 hartaua, (1905 tenos), 1920 sallida, 1988 jodio (cf. 2440), 2031 Palblo (intentional?), (2037 rason), 2039 andemos, 2054 araña, 2165 v otra, 2230 xallia, 2231 xtar, 2236 qualquiere, 2243 pidiras, 2250 a dalguna . . . phro, 2267 vex, 2269 xinora, 2278 quigeras, 2440 jodio, 2484 vubon?, 2513 sallia, 2519 sallir, 2635 sallid, 2652 Fin.

The variants of the *Vidriana* and the *Tesorina* are sufficient to show the merits as well as the defects of Cronan's work. The care with which he has performed the heavy task of copying, preparing for the printer, and reading the proof of eleven plays, four of them in two editions, deserves only the highest praise. If the amount of material that he handled were not so great, he might be criticised more severely for rejecting so many forms that are capable of justification. However, it would take years to make a critical text, and to explain the difficult passages of the plays that are found in this volume alone. Such a critical text being out of the question, the all-important thing is to have an accurate reproduction of the original. One might even admit that it is permissible to correct without mention certain classes of misprints. In the Gothic type it was easy to confuse such letters as the long *s* with *f* or *n* with *u*, and it does seem pedantic to crowd the variants with such forms as *pnes* for *pues* and *foy* for *soy*. But when, in his effort to make a readable text, the editor emends without mention in the notes dialect forms that can be proven to be correct, or even those that have the slightest chance of justification, the result is that his work is robbed of much of its value for linguistic study. Until more is known of the popular language of the sixteenth century, the safer way will be to give all the readings of the principal edition at least, even at the risk of appearing pedantic.

Two other plays of the volume under review have been compared with the originals without finding material that would modify the opinions expressed above. It is important to note,

however, that the earliest edition of Fernan Lopez de Yanguas' *Farsa del mundo* was overlooked. This text, which dates from 1524, has been described in the catalogues of the libraries of Salvá (No. 1300) and Heredia (No. 2312), and attention has been called to it more recently by Kohler, *Sieben spanische dramatische Eklogen*, 1911, p. 150. Both the 1528 and the 1551-editions appear to be copies of the earlier edition. Cronan's text, although based on the later prints, is not at all unsatisfactory.

Of the remaining texts four had already appeared in the above-mentioned volume of Kohler. Cronan's text of the *Egloga* of Juan de Paris is the better, in that it is based on the 1536 edition with variants of that of 1551, while Kohler used only the later text. The *Farsa* of Fernando Diaz, the *Egloga pastoril*, and the *Egloga nueva* were reprinted by both editors from the old editions now found in the Royal Library at Munich. While both editions are undoubtedly excellent, those who are engaged in linguistic study will prefer Kohler, because he gives in the foot-notes the original readings corresponding to his emendations.

RALPH E. HOUSE.

University of Chicago.

The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser.

Edited with critical notes by J. C. SMITH and E. DE SÉLINCOURT, with an introduction by E. DE SÉLINCOURT and a glossary. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1912. Small 8vo. Pp. lxvii + 736.

The student of Spenser has still to await a single-volume edition which quite supersedes others. Though this Oxford concise Spenser, in view of its tasteful critical introduction, its inclusion of the Spenser-Harvey letters,¹ its facsimile title-pages, and its woodcuts from *The Shepheardes Calendar*, offers the greatest inducements for the least money, yet the Globe

¹ Apparently by afterthought, since the editor (p. xxi, n. 2) refers to them as quoted in Grosart.

edition remains unique in offering the *View of Ireland* and best in biography (by the late J. W. Hales), while R. E. Neil Dodge's edition must be had for the 1590 text of the *Faerie Queene* and the list of characters therein. No edition since Todd (1805) contains an adequate body of notes.

The present text leaves little to be desired in accurate reproduction of words and spelling, following as it does the larger Oxford edition with partial correction of errors noted (see *Anglia Beiblatt*, XXII, 41 f.; *Englische Studien*, 44, 260 f.). In *Daphnaida* the prefatory letter is still needlessly that of 1596, because the British Museum copy of 1591 chanced to lack the letter. There is also considerable laxity in punctuation. Thus the sonnet to Harvey contains thirteen unnoted deviations and five tacit omissions of capitals (out of eight), according to the copy B. M. c. 40, d. 14, p. 75. Salutation and signature offer three more. Less excuse appears in *Astrophel*, ll. 14, 116, 170, 182, 194, 200,—all of which have a colon in B. M. 11536, and should have, because Spenser regularly so punctuates the second line of his six-line stanzas, as usually also the second line of the *Amoretti*.

The critical appendix singularly omits (p. 656) a note on *M. H. T.* 629, where the 1609 folio reads *he*, paralleling *R. T.* 447 and making it clear that the reigning sovereign is intended. The editor's experience with regard to *Mother Hubberds Tale*, of encountering folios dated only 1611 or 1612, is peculiar. The copy B. M. 78 h. 23 (like most I have seen) is dated 1613, though as usual bound in the 1611 folio of *The Faerie Queene*. A similar insouciance is encountered in the assistant's glossary, where William Alabaster, secretary of the Earl of Essex, figures as a pseudonym. So Amaryllis is 'a shepherdess,' though her sister Phyllis is rightly a pseudonym. Colin and Hobbinoll are omitted. *Astrophel*, despite warning (*N. Y. Nation*, 1910, Index, *Astrophel*) is entered as a botanical term. In fact the pseudonyms appear to be confined to those which occur in *Colin Clout*. Thus Meliboeus and Pastorella are omitted, and Alcyon and Daphne not referred to *Daphnaida*. Yet from the *Calendar*

Algrind is included, and not Dido. Equally the general principle of the glossary is not clear: it includes words referred only to Harvey (*agent*), and words obvious to the reader (*ambushment*, *dromedare*). It is, nevertheless, clear and full.

The hand of Sélincourt in this volume appears mainly in the introduction, which consists of two very unequal parts,—an inaccurate and ill-informed biography to which that by Hales remains superior, and a tasteful, timely appreciation of Spenser's poetry. For example, it ignores Gollancz's discovery that Spenser was secretary of Bishop Young; it repeats without reserve the discredited theory of Spenser's being associated with Lancashire. To make a test case of the first page: the lines quoted from the *Prothalamion* indicate that Spenser's ancestors, not necessarily his parents, were not Londoners. The identification of his father as John Spenser, here advanced without question, was never widely received and was withdrawn by its proposer, Grosart (see *The Spending of the Money of Robert Nowell*, p. xx). That Spenser was born in East Smithfield is a late and tenuous tradition; but Sélincourt's avowal that John Spenser lived there is an undocumented inference from it. With easy credence he furnishes the poet with a brother John and sister Elizabeth, sending the brother to the poet's school and college. This offering as fact a tissue of conjecture is so typical that no serious student of Spenser will look to this account except for suggestive flashes of insight. There Sélincourt is happy, as in the hazard that Spenser appeared before the Queen as a boy actor. It is apparent throughout that the writer relies on second-hand sources even when ostensibly quoting the original. He reproduces (p. xxxviii, top) Grosart's misreadings of the manuscript, printing 'you' for 'your lordships,' inserting 'all,' and omitting 'the service of' where he reads 'in the wars.'

The pages (xl–lxvii) in explanation and appreciation of the poetry of Spenser may be commended to students as both lucid and sensible. Sélincourt is not led astray by the heresy that Spenser lacked humor—an example of the oral tradition not uncommon in modern critical

scholarship. His faults are too exclusive pre-occupation with *The Faerie Queene*, a habit of universal statement, and a failure to recognize Spenser's following of precedent. The last appears in his implying (p. lv) that the idea of a fourth grace is original, whereas it dates from Homer (*Shep. Cal.*, April, Gloss, *The Graces*, June, Gloss, *Many Graces*). Nor does he indicate that Spenser's archaism is in reality a most conservative following of classical precedent: "unde *pictae vestis*, et *aulai*, Virgilius *amantis-simus vetustatis*, carminibus inseruit." Quinc-tilian, *Instit. Orator.* lib. 1. 7.

Before concluding, a challenge (p. liii) as to the identity of Calidore must be met. J. C. Smith urges that he is, like Sidney, distinguished as a runner and a wrestler. Only one reference indicates the latter (*F. Q.* 6. 9. 43-44). But there, to the contrary, we find an expert wrestler expecting in that sport "sure t'auenge his grudge" against Calidore. The latter wins by strength. It is not stated that he was apt in the art. That Calidore is a runner, I grant. But such an accomplishment would be unseemly haste in the knights of Holiness, Temperance, and Justice. The force of the comparison is further vitiated by comparison with 'the brave courtier' (*M. H. T.* 744-6) which merely declares that an ideal courtier will, among other forms of exercise, learn to wrestle. The advice was a commonplace of courtly instruction, familiar to any reader of Castiglione. In saying that the portrait of the courtier was 'drawn from Sidney,' the writer not only flatly contradicts his general view of Spenser's character portrayal (p. li), but misconceives the obvious method of composition. The portrayal of an ideal type—of poet, orator, courtier—was in ordinary course. Writers worked from the general to the particular, from the abstract to the concrete. This is especially obvious in a devotee to Platonic ideas.

Waiving judgment of details, the present volume is clearly the most serviceable one now available.

PERCY W. LONG.

Harvard University.

CORRESPONDENCE

WELLS' *Passionate Friends* AND FROMENTIN'S *Dominique*

From the outset let it be understood that I am not accusing Mr. Wells of plagiarism. My reading of *Passionate Friends* conjured up memories of a French novel of the latter half of the nineteenth century, Fromentin's *Dominique*, and upon analysing the two books I discovered that they had very much in common. I do not know whether Mr. Wells ever read the French novel. I sincerely hope he did, and if he did not, there is a fund of pleasure still in store for him.

Both novels depict the life of a man from his very earliest childhood until after he had passed through the greatest crisis of his existence and had reached the state of calm yet sad resignation. *Passionate Friends* is a document dedicated by a father to his son that he might be spared much sorrow and profit by the father's experience. The story of Fromentin is told by the man whose name the book bears to his friend, as an apology or an explanation of his present life. In detail the resemblance between the two novels is not very great, in spirit the resemblance becomes almost striking.

Dominique was introduced to the world of books and of careers by his tutor. Stephen, in *Passionate Friends*, was also under the spell of a tutor, but not so completely as Dominique, because after boyhood the tutor passed out of his life, while in the French novel the tutor acts as a father confessor to his pupil and is his friend for life. Dominique and Stephen meet the women who were to work such havoc in their lives when they are still youths at school. They are both extremely susceptible to the beauties of Nature. In *Dominique* the young woman marries a man she apparently does not love, but who is the choice of her family on account of his wealth. She does not allow him to guess her secret until all is over between them. Mary, in *Passionate Friends*, voluntarily and with a very clear purpose in mind, contracts a marriage with a man she